arXiv:1407.3767v1 [math.GN] 14 Jul 2014

AN EXAMPLE OF A RIGID κ-SUPERUNIVERSAL METRIC SPACE

WOJCIECH BIELAS

ABSTRACT. For a cardinal $\kappa > \omega$ a metric space X is called to be κ-superuniversal whenever for every metric space Y with $|Y| < \kappa$ every partial isometry from a subset of Y into X can be extended over the whole space Y. Examples of such spaces were given by Hechler [1] and Katětov [2]. In particular, Katětov showed that if $\omega < \kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$, then there exists a κ-superuniversal K which is moreover κ-homogeneous, i.e. every isometry of a subspace $Y \subseteq K$ with $|Y| < \kappa$ can be extended to an isometry of the whole K. In connection of this W. Kubiś suggested that there should also exist a κ-superuniversal space that is not κ-homogeneous. In this paper there is shown that for every cardinal κ there exists a κ-superuniversal space which is rigid, i.e. has exactly one isometry, namely the identity. The construction involves an amalgamation-like property of a family of metric spaces.

1. Introduction

If for every pair $Y_0 \subseteq Y$ of finite metric spaces and isometric embedding $f_0 : Y_0 \to X$ there is an isometric embedding $f : Y \to X$ such that $f \restriction Y_0 = f_0$, then we say that X is *finitely injective* ([7]). One of the first such spaces was constructed by Urysohn [8]. The example of Urysohn is a Polish metric space $\mathbb{U}$, universal in the class of all separable metric spaces and ω-*homogeneous*, which means that every isometry between finite subsets of $\mathbb{U}$ has an extension to an isometry of the whole $\mathbb{U}$. Urysohn also showed that in the case of separable Polish metric spaces, the universality (in the class of all separable metric spaces) together with the ω-homogeneity are equivalent to the finite injectivity. These notions have natural generalizations for infinite cardinal numbers. In [2] Hechler, for an uncountable cardinal κ, defined a metric space X to be κ-*superuniversal* if for every metric space Y of cardinality at most κ, every isometry from some subset of Y of cardinality less than κ into X can be extended to an isometry of the whole Y into X. Hechler showed that for every uncountable regular cardinal κ there exists a κ-superuniversal metric space of cardinality $\sum_{\lambda<\kappa} 2^\lambda$ and that such a space is unique up to isometry if and only if $\kappa = \sum_{\lambda<\kappa} 2^\lambda$. For an uncountable cardinal κ Katětov showed ([6]) that if $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$, then up to isometry there is exactly one κ-homogeneous metric space of weight κ, universal in the class of all metric spaces of weight κ. Every such space is κ-superuniversal. If $\kappa > \omega$, then every κ-superuniversal metric space is complete. In [6]

Katětov showed that there is an ω-superuniversal and ω-homogeneous metric space of weight ω which is also meager. By the back-and-forth argument, every κ-superuniversal metric space of cardinality κ is κ-homogeneous and universal in the class of all metric spaces of cardinality less than or equal to κ. As Katětov noted in [6], the existence of a κ-superuniversal metric space of weight κ for an uncountable $\kappa = \kappa^{<\kappa}$ can be deduced from Jónsson's theorems concerning relational systems ([5]). By *rigid metric space* we mean a metric space which has no nontrivial isometry ([4]). Obviously, Katětov's example is not rigid.

The main result of the paper is a construction of a κ-superuniversal metric space which is rigid.

We also prove that for every κ and every $\lambda > \kappa$ which is strongly inaccessible there exists a rigid κ-superuniversal metric space of cardinality λ.

2. Amalgamation of metric spaces

It is easy to define metrics d_{01}, d_{02}, d_{12} on sets $\{0,1\}$, $\{0,2\}$, $\{1,2\}$, respectively, in such a way that there is no metric d on $\{0,1,2\}$ such that $(\{i,j\}, d_{ij})$ is a subspace of $(\{0,1,2\}, d)$ for every $i < j \leqslant 2$. In this case points $0,1,2$ can be viewed as vertices constituting a cycle in a graph, which is also an induced cycle, contained in none of spaces $\{i,j\}$. We introduce a notion of a graph of a family of metric spaces and prove that if metrics are compatible on intersections of their domains and every induced cycle is contained in some element of the family, then there is a common extension of all the members of the family. We extensively use this method of amalgamation of a family of metric spaces in order to obtain a rigid κ-superuniversal metric space.

We follow standard notions of [1]; for a pseudometric space (X,d) and $Y \subseteq X$ we set $d \restriction Y = d \restriction (Y \times Y)$. We also consider Y to be a pseudometric space with the pseudometric $d \restriction Y$ and we will say that X is an *extension of* Y.

Assume that for every $s \in S$, d_s is a pseudometric on X_s. Let G be a graph with $\bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$ being the set of vertices where xy is an edge in G if there is $s \in S$ such that $x, y \in X_s$. We call a sequence $z_0z_1, z_1z_2, \ldots, z_{n-1}z_n$ a *path from x to y* if $z_0 = x$, $z_n = y$ and z_iz_{i+1} is an edge in G for all $i < n$. A path $z_0z_1, z_1z_2, \ldots, z_{n-1}z_n$ will be denoted also by $z_0 \ldots z_n$.

We say that a graph is *connected* if for its every two points x and y there exists a path from x to y. If a path is of the form $z_0 \ldots z_n z_0$, then we say that it is a *closed path*. If $z_0 \ldots z_n$ is a closed path and $z_i \neq z_j$ for all $i < j < n$, then we say that $z_0 \ldots z_n$ is a *cycle*. We say that a path in G is *induced* if no two vertices of the path are connected by an edge that does not itself belong to the path. Observe that if $d_s \restriction (X_s \cap X_t) = d_t(X_s \cap X_t)$ for every $s, t \in S$, then the following notion is correctly defined: if $z_0 \ldots z_n$ is a path

and $s_1, \dots, s_n$ are such that $z_i z_{i+1} \in X_{s_i}$ for $i < n$, then we call the number

$$w(z_0 \dots z_n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_{s_{i+1}}(z_i, z_{i+1})$$

the *weight of* $z_0 \dots z_n$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be the graph of the family $\{(X_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$ of metric spaces such that $d_s \restriction (X_s \cap X_t) = d_t \restriction (X_s \cap X_t)$ for all $s, t \in S$, $s \neq t$. If $z_0 \dots z_n$ is a path in G and $z_0 \neq z_n$, then there exists a subset $\{z_{i_0}, z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_m}\}$ such that $z_{i_0} = z_0$, $z_{i_m} = z_n$, $z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m}$ is a path and $z_{i_k} \neq z_{i_j}$ for $k < j \leqslant m$. Moreover, $w(z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m}) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_n)$.*

Proof. Observe that for $n = 1$ our claim holds.

Fix $n < \omega$ and assume that our claim holds for every path $z_0 \dots z_k$ for all $k \leqslant n$. Fix a path $z_0 \dots z_n z_{n+1}$ and assume that $z_0 \neq z_{n+1}$ and there are $i, j \leqslant n+1$ such that $z_i = z_j$. Consider the case $z_0 = z_n$. Then $\{z_0, z_{n+1}\}$ is a subset of distinct vertices such that $z_0 \dots z_{n+1}$ is a path and

$$w(z_0 z_{n+1}) = w(z_n z_{n+1}) = d_{s_{n+1}}(z_n, z_{n+1}) \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{n} d_{s_{i+1}}(z_i, z_{i+1}) = w(z_0 \dots z_n z_{n+1})$$

for some $s_1, \dots, s_{n+1} \in S$ such that $z_i, z_{i+1} \in X_{s_{i+1}}$ for all $i \leqslant n$.

Consider the case $z_0 \neq z_n$. If vertices of the path $z_0 \dots z_n$ are not distinct, then from the induction hypothesis there exists $\{z_{i_0}, \dots, z_{i_m}\} \subseteq \{z_0 \dots z_n\}$ such that $z_{i_0} = z_0$, $z_{i_m} = z_n$, vertices of $z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m}$ are distinct and $w(z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m}) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_n)$. Observe that $m < n$, hence $z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m} z_{n+1}$ can be written as $w_0 \dots w_k$ for some $k \leqslant n$, thus from the induction hypothesis there exists $\{z_{j_0}, \dots, z_{j_k}\} \subseteq \{z_{i_0}, \dots, z_{i_m}, z_{n+1}\}$ such that $z_{j_0} = z_{i_0}$, $z_{j_k} = z_{n+1}$, vertices of $z_{j_0} \dots z_{j_k}$ are distinct and $w(z_{j_0} \dots z_{j_k}) \leqslant w(z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m} z_{n+1})$. Thus

$$w(z_{j_0} \dots z_{j_k}) \leqslant w(z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m} z_{n+1}) = w(z_{i_0} \dots z_{i_m}) + d_s(z_{i_m}, z_{n+1}) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_n) + d_s(z_{i_m}, z_{n+1}) = w(z_0 \dots z_{n+1})$$

for some $s \in S$ such that $z_{i_m}, z_{n+1} \in X_s$. If vertices of $z_0 \dots z_n$ are distinct, then vertices of $z_1 \dots z_{n+1}$ are not distinct and we proceed analogously to the previous setting. □

If d is a pseudometric on X, then the graph of a family $\{(X, d)\}$ is a complete graph, hence $x z_0 \dots z_n y$ is a path from x to y for any $x, y, z_0, \dots, z_n \in X$. Thus we can define

$$d(x, Z_1, \dots, Z_n, y) = \inf\{w(x z_1 \dots z_n y) : (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in Z_1 \times \dots \times Z_n\},$$

$$d(x, Z) = \inf\{d(x, z) : z \in Z\},$$

for $x, y \in X$ and $Z, Z_1, \dots, Z_n \subseteq X$.

The fact that the class of all metric spaces has the amalgamation property is attributed, by Morley and Vaught, to Sierpiński [3]. The following theorem gives the amalgam of an arbitrary large family of pseudometric spaces.

Theorem 2.2 (Amalgamation lemma)**.** *Assume that $\{(X_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$ is a family of pseudometric spaces with connected graph G such that*

(i) *$d_s \restriction (X_s \cap X_t) = d_t \restriction (X_s \cap X_t)$ for all $s, t \in S$,*
(ii) *if $x_1 \dots x_n$ is an induced cycle in G, then there is $s \in S$ such that $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X_s$.*

Then there is a pseudometric ρ on the set $\bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$ such that $\rho \restriction X_s = d_s$ for every $s \in S$.

Moreover, if there is $s_0 \in S$ such that $X_s \cap X_{s_0} \neq \emptyset$ and $X_s \cap X_t \subseteq X_{s_0}$ for all $s \neq t$, then for all $s \neq t$, $x \in X_s$, $y \in X_t$, $w \in X_{s_0} \cup X_t$:

$$\rho(x, y) = \rho(x, X_s \cap X_{s_0}, X_t \cap X_{s_0}, y),$$

$$\rho(x, w) = \rho(x, X_s \cap X_{s_0}, w).$$

Proof. Fix $x, y \in \bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$. Since G is connected there is a path $z_0 \dots z_n$ from x to y, i.e. $z_0 = x$, $z_n = y$ and for each $i < n$ there is $s_i \in S$ such that $z_i, z_{i+1} \in X_{s_{i+1}}$. Thus we define

$$\rho(x, y) = \inf\{w(z_0 \dots z_n) : z_0 \dots z_n \text{ is a path from } x \text{ to } y\}.$$

It is easy to see that ρ is symmetric. Fix $x, y, z \in \bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$. Let $y_0 \dots y_n$ be a path from x to y, and let $z_0 \dots z_m$ be a path from y to z. Then $y_0 \dots y_n z_1 \dots z_m$ is a path from x to z. Thus $\rho(x, z) \leqslant w(y_0 \dots y_n z_1 \dots z_m)$. Since paths $y_0 \dots y_n$ and $z_0 \dots z_m$ have been taken arbitrarily, we have $\rho(x, z) \leqslant \rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z)$. Obviously $\rho(x, y) \leqslant d_s(x, y)$ for $x, y \in X_s$. Fix $x, y \in X_s$ and a path $z_0 z_1 z_2$ from x to y. If $z_0 = z_2$, then $x = y$ and $d_s(x, y) = 0 \leqslant \rho(x, y)$. If $z_0 \neq z_2$ and $|\{z_0, z_1, z_2\}| \leqslant 2$, then $\{z_0, z_1, z_2\} \subseteq X_s$ and

$$d_s(x, y) \leqslant d_s(x, z_1) + d_s(z_1, y) = w(z_0 z_1 z_2).$$

Consider the case $|\{z_0, z_1, z_2\}| = 3$. Since $z_0 z_1 z_2 z_0$ is an induced cycle in G, there is $t \in S$ such that $z_0, z_1, z_2 \in X_t$. Then

$$d_s(x, y) = d_t(x, y) \leqslant d_t(z_0, z_1) + d_t(z_1, z_2) = w(z_0 z_1 z_2).$$

Fix $2 \leqslant n < \omega$ and assume that $d_s(x, y) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_k)$ for all $2 \leqslant k < n$, $s \in S$, $x, y \in X_s$ and a path $z_0 \dots z_k$ from x to y. Fix $x, y \in X_s$ and a path $z_0 \dots z_n$ from x to y. By Lemma 2.1 we can assume that $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ is a cycle. If $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ is an induced cycle, then the situation is analogous to the case $n = 2$. Thus assume that $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ is not an induced cycle. There is an edge $z_i z_j$ in G which is not an edge in $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$. We can assume that $i < j \leqslant n$, hence $1 < i + 1 < j$ or $i + 1 < j < n$. There is $t \in S$ such that $z_i, z_j \in X_t$, hence $z_0 \dots z_{i-1} z_i z_j z_{j+1} \dots z_n$ is a path from x to y of length $i + 1 + (n - j) < j + (n - j) = n$, and $z_i z_{i+1} \dots z_{j-1} z_j$ is a path from z_i to z_j of length $j - i < n$, since $i > 0$ or $j < n$. From the induction hypothesis

we have $d_s(x,y) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_i z_j \dots z_n)$ and $d_t(z_i, z_j) \leqslant w(z_i z_{i+1} \dots z_{j-1} z_j)$. Thus

$$d_s(x,y) \leqslant w(z_0 \dots z_i z_j \dots z_n) = w(z_0 \dots z_i) + d_t(z_i, z_j) + w(z_j \dots z_n) \leqslant \\ w(z_0 \dots z_i) + w(z_i z_{i+1} \dots z_{j-1} z_j) + w(z_j \dots z_n) = w(z_0 \dots z_n).$$

This shows that $d_s(x,y) \leqslant \rho(x,y)$, hence $d_s(x,y) = \rho(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in X_s$.

Assume that $s_0 \in S$ is such that $X_s \cap X_{s_0} \neq \emptyset$ and $X_s \cap X_t \subseteq X_{s_0}$ for every $s \neq t$. Fix $s \neq t$, $x \in X_s$ and $y \in X_t$. Obviously $\rho(x,y) \leqslant \rho(x, X_s \cap X_{s_0}, X_t \cap X_{s_0}, y)$. If $x, y \in X_{s_0}$, then $(x,y) \in (X_s \cap X_{s_0}) \times (X_t \cap X_{s_0})$, hence

$$\rho(x,y) = w(xxyy) \geqslant \rho(x, X_s \cap X_{s_0}, X_t \cap X_{s_0}, y).$$

If $x = y$, then $x, y \in X_t \cap X_s \subseteq X_{s_0}$, hence it is the previous case. Consider the case $x \neq y$ and fix a path $z_0 \dots z_n$ from x to y. By Lemma 2.1 we can assume that $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ is a cycle. We will show that there are $i, j \leqslant n$ such that $z_i \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$ and $z_j \in X_t \cap X_{s_0}$. Consider the case $x \notin X_{s_0}$ and $y \in X_{s_0}$. Suppose that there is no i such that $z_i \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$. Let

$$i = \max\{r : z_0, \dots, z_r \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}\}.$$

Since $z_n = y \in X_{s_0}$, we have $i < n$. Thus $z_{i+1} \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$, hence $z_{i+1} \notin X_s$ or $z_{i+1} \in X_{s_0}$. If $z_{i+1} \in X_s$, then $z_{i+1} \in X_{s_0}$ and $z_{i+1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$, contrary to our assumption. Thus $z_{i+1} \notin X_s$. Since $z_i z_{i+1}$ is an edge, there is $p \in S$ such that $z_i, z_{i+1} \in X_p$. Since $z_{i+1} \notin X_s$, we have $s \neq p$. Then $X_s \cap X_p \subseteq X_{s_0}$. From the definition of i we have $z_i \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$, hence $z_i \in X_p \cap X_s \subseteq X_{s_0}$, a contradiction.

The case $x \in X_{s_0}$ and $y \notin X_{s_0}$ is analogous to the previous one.

Consider the case $x \notin X_{s_0}$ and $y \notin X_{s_0}$. Suppose that there are no $i, j \leqslant n$ such that $z_i \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$ and $z_j \in X_t \cap X_{s_0}$. Then

$(*)$ $z_i \notin X_s \cap X_{s_0}$ or $z_j \notin X_t \cap X_{s_0}$ for each $i, j \leqslant n$.

Since $z_0 = x \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$ and $z_n = y \in X_t \setminus X_{s_0}$, the following numbers are correctly defined:

$$i = \max\{r : z_0, \dots, z_r \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}\} \text{ and } j = \min\{r : z_r, \dots, z_n \in X_t \setminus X_{s_0}\}.$$

Since $X_s \cap X_t \subseteq X_{s_0}$, we have $i < j$. Thus

$$z_{i+1} \notin X_s \setminus X_{s_0} \text{ and } z_{j-1} \notin X_t \setminus X_{s_0}.$$

By $(*)$ we have

$$z_{i+1} \notin X_s \cap X_{s_0} \text{ or } z_{j-1} \notin X_t \cap X_{s_0}.$$

If $z_{i+1} \notin X_s \cap X_{s_0}$, then $z_{i+1} \notin X_s$. Since $z_i z_{i+1}$ is an edge, there is $p \in S$ such that $z_i, z_{i+1} \in X_p$. Since $z_{i+1} \notin X_s$, we have $p \neq s$, hence $X_s \cap X_p \subseteq X_{s_0}$. By the definition of i we have that $z_i \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$, hence $z_i \in X_s \cap X_p \subseteq X_{s_0}$, a contradiction. If $z_{j-1} \notin X_t \cap X_{s_0}$, then an analogous argument provides a contradiction. Thus there are $i, j \leqslant n$ such that $z_i \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$ and

$z_j \in X_t \cap X_{s_0}$. Since $z_0 \dots z_n$ is a path there are $s_1, \dots, s_n \in S$ such that $z_k, z_{k+1} \in X_{s_{k+1}}$ for each $k < n$. Then

$$\rho(x, z_i) + \rho(z_i, z_j) + \rho(z_j, y) \leqslant \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \rho(z_k, z_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} \rho(z_k, z_{k+1}) + \sum_{k=j}^{n-1} \rho(z_k, z_{k+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \rho(z_k, z_{k+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d_{s_{k+1}}(z_k, z_{k+1}) = w(z_0 \dots z_n).$$

We prove analogously that $\rho(x, w) = \rho(x, X_s \cap X_{s_0}, w)$ for every $x \in X_s$ and $w \in X_{s_0} \cup X_t$. □

We obtain the theorem which in particular gives a hedgehog space.

Theorem 2.3 (Main theorem)**.** *Assume that $s_0 \in S$ and $\{(X_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$ is a family of metric spaces such that for all $s, t \in S$:*

(i) $X_{s_0} \cap X_s \neq \emptyset$,
(ii) $X_s \cap X_t \subseteq X_{s_0}$ *whenever* $s \neq t$,
(iii) $d_{s_0} \restriction (X_{s_0} \cap X_s) = d_s \restriction (X_{s_0} \cap X_s)$.

Then there exists a metric space (Y, d) such that

(iv) X_{s_0} *is a subspace of* Y,
(v) *for every* $s \in S \setminus \{s_0\}$ *there is an isometric embedding* $i_s : X_s \to Y$ *such that* $i_s \restriction (X_{s_0} \cap X_s) = \mathrm{id}_{X_{s_0} \cap X_s}$,
(vi) $Y \subseteq \bigcup_{s \in S} X_s$,
(vii) *for all* $s \neq t$, *if* $x \in i_s[X_s]$, $y \in i_t[X_t]$, $z \in X_{s_0} \cup i_t[X_t]$, *then*

$$d(x, y) = d(x, X_{s_0} \cap X_s, X_{s_0} \cap X_t, y),$$
$$d(x, z) = d(x, X_{s_0} \cap X_s, z).$$

Moreover, if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $d_s(x, y) \geqslant \delta$ for every $s \in S \setminus \{s_0\}$, $x \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$ and $y \in X_{s_0}$, then $Y = \bigcup_{s \in S} X_s$ and $i_s = \mathrm{id}_{X_s}$ for every $s \in S \setminus \{s_0\}$.

Proof. Suppose that the graph of $\{(X_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$ does not satisfy condition (ii) of Theorem 2.2. Then there exists an induced cycle $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ such that $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \not\subseteq X_s$ for each $s \in S$. In particular, $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \not\subseteq X_{s_0}$, hence there exists i such that $z_i \notin X_{s_0}$. There is $s \in S$ such that $z_i \in X_s$. Let

$$j = \min\{r \leqslant i : z_r, \dots, z_i \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}\},$$
$$k = \max\{r \geqslant i : z_i, \dots, z_r \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}\},$$
$$m = \sup\{r \geqslant 0 : z_0, \dots, z_r \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}\}.$$

We will show that if $j > 0$, then $z_{j-1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$. Assume that $j > 0$. Then $z_{j-1} \notin X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$, hence $z_{j-1} \notin X_s$ or $z_{j-1} \in X_{s_0}$. There exists $t \in S$ such that $z_{j-1}, z_j \in X_t$. If $z_{j-1} \notin X_s$, then $t \neq s$ and $z_j \in X_s \cap X_t \subseteq X_{s_0}$,

contrary to the definition of j. Thus $z_{j-1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$. It can be shown analogously that:

(a) if $k < n$, then $z_{k+1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$,
(b) if $z_0 \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$ and $m < n$, then $z_{m+1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$.

If $j = 0$ and $k = n$, then $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$, a contradiction. Thus $j > 0$ or $k < n$. Consider the case $j > 0$ and $k < n$. Then $z_{j-1}, z_{k+1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$. Thus $z_{j-1}z_{k+1}$ is an edge. Since $z_0 \dots z_n z_0$ is an induced cycle and $j \leqslant k$, we have $j-1 = 0$ and $k+1 = n$, hence $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$, a contradiction. Consider the case $j > 0$ and $k = n$. Then $\{z_{j-1}, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$. There is $p \in S$ such that $z_n, z_0 \in X_p$. If $p \neq s$, then $z_k = z_n \in X_s \cap X_p \subseteq X_{s_0}$, contrary to the definition of k. Thus $z_0 \in X_s$. If $z_0 \in X_{s_0}$, then $z_0 z_{j-1}$ is an edge, hence $j = 1$ and $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$, a contradiction. Thus $z_0 \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$. Then $m < j-1$ since $\{z_{j-1}, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$. By (b), $z_{m+1} \in X_s \cap X_{s_0}$. Then $z_{m+1}z_n$ is an edge, hence $m+1 = n-1$. Thus $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\} = \{z_0, \dots, z_{m+1}, z_n\} \subseteq X_s$, a contradiction. Similar arguments apply to the case $j = 0$ and $k < n$.

We have shown that the graph of $\{(X_s, d_s) : s \in S\}$ satisfies condition (ii) from Theorem 2.2, thus there is an appropriate pseudometric ρ on the set $\bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$. It is known that the relation $\sim$, given by the formula

$$x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \rho(x, y) = 0,$$

is an equivalence on $\bigcup_{s\in S} X_s$. Let Y be a transversal of $\{[x] : x \in \bigcup_{s\in S} X_s\}$ such that $X_{s_0} \subseteq Y$, where $[x]$ is an equivalence class of x. Then (Y, ρ) is a metric space. For $s \in S$ and $x \in X_s$ we define $i_s : X_s \to Y$, $i_s(x) \in [x] \cap Y$.

Assume that there is $\delta > 0$ such that $d_s(x, y) \geqslant \delta$ for every $s \in S \setminus \{s_0\}$, $x \in X_s \setminus X_{s_0}$ and $y \in X_{s_0}$. If $\rho(x, y) = 0$, then there is $s \in S$ such that $x, y \in X_s$, since otherwise $\rho(x, y) \geqslant 2\delta$. Then $0 = \rho(x, y) = d_s(x, y)$, hence $x = y$. □

We will call the space Y described above the *amalgam of the family* $\{X_s : s \in S\}$.

3. The isometric extension

Fix a metric space X and a cardinal κ. We also fix a set A of cardinality $\lambda = (|X| + \mathfrak{c})^{<\kappa}$, disjoint with X, and a partition $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq [A]^\lambda$ of the set A. Let us enumerate (we allow repeating elements)

$$[X]^{<\kappa} = \{X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_\alpha = \{a_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda\}.$$

If Z is a set of cardinality less than κ, then

$$|\{\rho \in {}^{Z\times Z}\mathbb{R} : \rho \text{ is a metric on } Z\}| \leqslant \mathfrak{c}^{<\kappa} \leqslant \lambda.$$

Thus there exist a family $\{d_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda\}$ of metrics on sets from the family $\{X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\} : \beta < \lambda\}$, such that for every $\alpha < \lambda$:

(1) $d_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a metric on $X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\}$ for every $\beta < \lambda$,
(2) $d \restriction X_\alpha = d_{\alpha,\beta} \restriction X_\alpha$ for every $\beta < \lambda$,

(3) if Y is a metric space and if $f_0 : Y \setminus \{y\} \to X_\alpha$ is an isometry, then there exists $\beta < \lambda$ and an isometry $f : Y \to X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\}$ such that $f \restriction (Y \setminus \{y\}) = f_0$.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{X\} \cup \{X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\} : \alpha, \beta < \lambda\}$. Observe that with $X_{s_0} = X$ the family $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies assumptions of Theorem 2.3, hence there exists an amalgam (Y, d) of $\mathcal{R}$ such that:

(4) X is a subspace of Y,
(5) $Y \subseteq \bigcup\{X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\} : \alpha, \beta < \lambda\}$,
(6) for all $\alpha, \beta < \lambda$ there exists an isometric embedding $i_{\alpha,\beta} : X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\} \to Y$ such that $i_{\alpha,\beta} \restriction X_\alpha = \mathrm{id}_{X_\alpha}$,
(7) for all $y \in Y$ there exists $\alpha < \lambda$ such that for all $x \in X$:

$$d(y, x) = d(y, X_\alpha, x).$$

The amalgam of the family $\mathcal{R}$ will be denoted by $F(X)$.

Theorem 3.1. *For every metric space X, $F(X)$ is an extension of X such that*

(i) *if $|Y| < \kappa$, then every isometric embedding $f_0 : Y \setminus \{y\} \to X$ has an extension to an isometric embedding $f : Y \to F(X)$,*
(ii) *for every $y \in F(X)$ there is $Z \in [X]^{<\kappa}$ such that $d(x, y) = d(x, Z, y)$ for each $x \in X$, where d is the metric of $F(X)$.*

Proof. Fix a metric space X and assume that $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} = [X]^{<\kappa} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and $\{d_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda\}$ satisfy conditions (1)–(3) from the beginning of this section.

(i) Fix a metric space Y, $|Y| < \kappa$, $y \in Y$, and an isometric embedding $f_0 : Y \setminus \{y\} \to X$. There is $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $f_0[Y \setminus \{y\}] = X_\alpha$. Thus $f_0 : Y \setminus \{y\} \to X_\alpha$ is an isometry. By (3) there is $\beta < \lambda$ and an isometry $g : Y \to X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\}$ such that $g \restriction (Y \setminus \{y\}) = f_0$. By (6) there is an isometric embedding $i_{\alpha,\beta} : X_\alpha \cup \{a_{\alpha,\beta}\} \to F(X)$ such that $i_{\alpha,\beta} \restriction X_\alpha = \mathrm{id}_{X_\alpha}$. The function $f = i_{\alpha,\beta} \circ g : Y \to F(X)$ is an isometric embedding. For all $y' \in Y \setminus \{y\}$ we have

$$f(y') = i_{\alpha,\beta}(g(y')) = i_{\alpha,\beta}(f_0(y)) = f_0(y),$$

since $f_0(y) \in X_\alpha$. Thus $f \restriction (Y \setminus \{y\}) = f_0$.

(ii) Fix $y \in F(X)$. By (7) there is $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $d(y, x) = d(y, X_\alpha, x)$ for all $x \in X$. □

In [6] Katětov construed an extension $E(X, \kappa)$ which satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of the above theorem. The metric σ of the extension $E(X, \kappa)$ satisfies for $x, y \in E(X, \kappa) \setminus X$ the following equality

$$\sigma(x, y) = \sup\{|\sigma(x, z) - \sigma(y, z)| : z \in X\}$$

that is, the distance $\sigma(x, y)$ is as small as possible. It can be shown that for $x, y \in F(X) \setminus X$ we have

$$\rho(x, y) = \inf\{\rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y) : z \in X\}$$

that is, the distance $\rho(x,y)$ is as large as possible.

4. The discrete character of a point

We say that a metric space (Y,σ) is *discrete* if $\sigma(x,y)\in\{0,1\}$ for all $x,y\in Y$. If Y is a discrete subspace of (X,d), then by the *middle point of Y in X* we mean $x\in X$ such that $d(x,y)=1/2$ for every $y\in Y$. If there is no middle point of a discrete subspace $Y\subseteq X$, then we say that Y is *without middle points in X*. If cardinal κ is fixed and every $Z\in[Y]^\kappa$ is without middle points, then we say that Y is *hereditarily without middle points in X*. We call the cardinal

$$\tau_\kappa(x,X)=\sup\{|Y| : Y\subseteq X \text{ is hereditarily without middle points in } X \text{ and } x\in Y\}$$

the *discrete character of x in X*.

Lemma 4.1. *If $f:X\to X$ is an isometry, then x and $f(x)$ have the same discrete character.*

Proof. Fix $x\in X$, an isometry $f:X\to X$ and hereditarily without middle points subspace $Y\subseteq X$ such that $x\in Y$. Let d be the metric of X. Suppose that $f[Y]$ is not hereditarily without middle points. Thus there is $Z\in[f[Y]]^\kappa$ with a middle point $z\in X$. Then $f^{-1}[Z]\in[Y]^\kappa$. Observe that $d(f^{-1}(z),f^{-1}(x))=d(z,x)$ for all $z\in Z$. Then $f^{-1}(z)$ is a middle point of $f^{-1}[Z]$, a contradiction. □

By the *weak middle point of* a discrete subspace $Y\subseteq X$ we mean $x\in X$ such that $d(x,y)=d(x,y')<1$ for all $y,y'\in Y$. By $d(x,A)=\inf\{d(x,a) : a\in A\}$ we denote the distance between x and A if $A\neq\emptyset$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that κ is a regular cardinal such that $\lambda^{\aleph_0}<\kappa$ for $\lambda<\kappa$. Assume that (X,d) is an extension of Y such that for every $x\in X\setminus Y$ there is $Z\in[Y]^{<\kappa}$ such that $d(x,y)=d(x,Z,y)$ for all $y\in Y$. Then for every $\varepsilon>0$ and a weak middle point $x\in X\setminus Y$ of a discrete subspace $D\in[Y]^\kappa$ there exist $D'\in[D]^\kappa$ and a weak middle point $y\in Y$ of D' such that $d(x,y)+d(y,D')<d(x,D)+\varepsilon$.*

Proof. We can assume that $\varepsilon<1-d(x,D)$. Let $Z\in[Y]^{<\kappa}$ be such that $d(x,y)=d(x,Z,y)$ for all $y\in Y$. For each $y\in D$ there is $(t_{y,n})_{n<\omega}\subseteq Z$ such that $d(x,y)=\lim_{n\to\infty}(d(x,t_{y,n})+d(t_{y,n},y))$. Thus we have function $\Phi:D\to{}^\omega(Z\times\mathbb{R})$,

$$\Phi(y)=(t_{y,n},d(t_{y,n},y))_{n<\omega}$$

for $y\in D$. Since $|{}^\omega(Z\times\mathbb{R})|=|Z|^{\aleph_0}\cdot\mathfrak{c}<\kappa$, there is $(z_n,r_n)_{n<\omega}\in{}^\omega(Z\times\mathbb{R})$ such that $|\Phi^{-1}[\{(z_n,r_n)_{n<\omega}\}]|=|D|$. Let $D'=\Phi^{-1}[\{(z_n,r_n)_{n<\omega}\}]$. There is $n<\omega$ such that $d(x,z_n)+d(z_n,D')<d(x,D)+\varepsilon<1$. Fix $y,y'\in D'$. Then $\Phi(y)=\Phi(y')$, hence $t_{y,n}=t_{y',n}=z_n$ and $d(z_n,y)=d(z_n,y')=r_n<1$. Thus $z_n\in Y$ is a weak middle point of D'. □

5. The operation of adding discrete subspaces

Fix a metric space X and $Y \subseteq X$. Let $X \setminus Y = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ for some cardinal number λ. For every $\alpha < \lambda$, let D_α be a set disjoint with X such that $|D_\alpha| = \aleph_{\kappa+|X|+\alpha+2}$. We can assume that $D_\alpha \cap D_\beta = \emptyset$ for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$. Let d_α be a metric on the set $D_\alpha \cup \{x_\alpha\}$ which makes it a discrete space. Using Theorem 2.3 for the family $\{X\} \cup \{D_\alpha \cup \{x_\alpha\} : \alpha < \lambda\}$ we obtain an amalgam $A(X,Y) = X \cup \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} D_\alpha$ and a family $\mathcal{A}(X,Y) = \{D_\alpha \cup \{x_\alpha\} : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that

- (A1) for every $x \in X \setminus Y$ there exists a discrete subspace $D_x \in \mathcal{A}(X,Y)$ such that $D_x \cap X = \{x\}$ and $|D_x| > |X| \cdot \kappa^+$,
- (A2) for every $x, y \in X \setminus Y$, if $x \neq y$, then $|D_x| \neq |D_y|$,
- (A3) $d(x', y) = d(x', x) + d(x, y) = 1 + d(x, y)$ for all $x \in X \setminus Y$, $x' \in D_x \setminus \{x\}$ and $y \in X$, where d is the metric of $A(X,Y)$.
- (A4) X is a subspace of $A(X,Y)$.

We define

$$\mathcal{D}(X) = \{Y \in [X]^\kappa : Y \text{ is hereditarily without middle points}\}.$$

Fix $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(X)$. Let $\{Y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} = \{Y \in \mathcal{D}(X) : \forall_{Z\in\mathcal{G}} |Y \cap Z| < \kappa\}$ for some cardinal number λ. Let $Z = \{z_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ be a set of cardinality λ, disjoint with X. For every $\alpha < \lambda$ let

$$d_\alpha(x,y) = \begin{cases} d(x,y), & \text{if } x, y \in Y_\alpha, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } y \in Y_\alpha, x = z_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

Then d_α is a metric on $Y_\alpha \cup \{z_\alpha\}$. Using Theorem 2.3 for $\{X\} \cup \{Y_\alpha \cup \{z_\alpha\} : \alpha < \lambda\}$ we obtain an amalgam $S(X,\mathcal{G}) = X \cup Z$ with metric ρ such that

- (S1) for each $Y \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ such that $|Y \cap Z| < \kappa$ for all $Z \in \mathcal{G}$, there is $Y' \in [Y]^\kappa$ and a middle point $x \in S(X,\mathcal{G})$ of Y',
- (S2) for every $y \in S(X,\mathcal{G})$ there is a discrete subspace $Y \in [X]^\kappa$ such that $\rho(y,x) = \rho(y,Y,x)$ for all $x \in S(X,\mathcal{G}) \setminus \{y\}$.

6. A construction of a rigid κ-superuniversal metric space

We recall the following easy observation.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\{Z_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ be a family of metric spaces such that Z_β is a subspace of Z_γ, for all $\beta < \gamma$. Then there exists the metric ρ on the set $\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} Z_\gamma$ such that Z_β is a subspace of $\bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} Z_\gamma$, for all $\beta < \alpha$.*

Assume that $\kappa > \mathfrak{c}$ is a regular cardinal such that $\lambda^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$ for $\lambda < \kappa$, for example $\kappa = \mathfrak{c}^+$. We define the empty metric space $X_0 = \emptyset$ and a single-element metric space $X_1 = \{0\}$. Assume that we have constructed an increasing chain of metric spaces $\{(X_\beta, d_\beta) : \beta < \alpha\}$.

If α is a limit ordinal, then we set

$$X_{\alpha+1} = X_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} X_\beta \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{A}(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha) = \emptyset.$$

If $\alpha = \beta + 2$ for some $\beta < \alpha$, then we set

$$X_\alpha = F(S(A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta), \bigcup_{\gamma \leqslant \beta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\gamma+1}, X_\gamma))). \tag{1}$$

Thus we obtain a metric space (X_{κ^+}, d), $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ with the following properties:

(P1) $X_{\kappa^+} = \bigcup\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$,
(P2) X_β is a subspace of X_α for all $\beta < \alpha < \kappa^+$,
(P3) for all $\alpha < \kappa^+$, if α is limit, then $X_{\alpha+1} = X_\alpha = \bigcup\{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and $\mathcal{A}(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha) = \emptyset$,
(P4) if $\alpha = \beta + 2 < \kappa^+$, then the formula (1) holds,
(P5) for all $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ there exists $\alpha < \kappa$ and a discrete subspace $D_x \in \mathcal{A}(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha)$ such that $x \in X_{\alpha+1} \setminus X_\alpha$ and $D_x \cap X_{\alpha+1} = \{x\}$,
(P6) every point of $X_{\kappa^+} \setminus X_1$ is added by F, S or A.

We define *rank* $r(x) = \min\{\alpha < \kappa^+ : x \in X_\alpha\}$ *of* $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$.

Theorem 6.2. *X_{κ^+} is κ-superuniversal.*

Proof. Fix a metric space Y of cardinality less than κ, $y \in Y$ and an isometric embedding $f_0 : Y \setminus \{y\} \to X_{\kappa^+}$. There exists $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that $f_0[Y \setminus \{y\}] \subseteq X_\alpha$. Moreover we have

$$X_\alpha \subseteq X_{\alpha+2} \subseteq S(A(X_{\alpha+2}, X_{\alpha+1}, \bigcup_{\gamma \leqslant \alpha} \mathcal{A}(X_{\gamma+1}, X_\gamma))).$$

From the condition (i) of Theorem 3.1 there exists an isometric embedding $f : Y \to X_{\alpha+3}$ such that $f \restriction (Y \setminus \{y\}) = f_0$. The rest of the proof is an easy induction on the number of points we have to add to the domain of an isometric embedding. □

The proof of the main theorem will be preceded by a series of lemmas.

Lemma 6.3. *Assume that $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ and y is a weak middle point of $D \in [D_x]^\kappa$. Then $r(x) < r(y)$ and y is added by F or S. Moreover, if y is a middle point of D, then y is added by F.*

Proof. There are $\beta, \delta < \kappa^+$ such that $x \in X_{\beta+2} \setminus X_{\beta+1}$ and $y \in X_{\delta+2} \setminus X_{\delta+1}$. Thus $r(y) = \delta + 2$ and $r(x) = \beta + 2$.

Suppose that $r(x) \geqslant r(y)$. Since $r(y) \leqslant \beta + 2$ we have $y \in X_{\beta+2}$, hence by the property (A3):

$$d(v, y) = d(v, x) + d(x, y) = 1 + d(x, y) \geqslant 1$$

for all $v \in D_x \setminus \{x\}$, a contradiction, since y is a weak middle point of $D \subseteq D_x$. Thus $r(x) < r(y)$, hence $r(x) \leqslant \delta + 1$.

Suppose that y is added by A. Then there is $w \in X_{\delta+1}$ such that $y \in D_w \setminus \{w\}$. Thus $D_x \cup D_w \subseteq A(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta)$, hence by (A3) we have

$$d(y, v) = d(y, w) + d(w, v) \geqslant 1$$

for all $v \in D_x$, contrary to the fact that y is a weak middle point of D.

Suppose that y is a middle point of D added by S. Then there exists a discrete subspace $Z \in [A(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta)]^\kappa$ such that

$$d(y,w) = d(y,Z,w) \quad \text{for all } w \in A(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta) \setminus \{y\},$$

and $|Z \cap D'| < \kappa$ for all $D' \in \bigcup_{\zeta \leqslant \delta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\zeta+1}, X_\zeta)$. Since $r(x) \leqslant \delta + 1$ we have $x \in X_{\delta+1}$, hence $D_x \in \bigcup_{\zeta \leqslant \delta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\zeta+1}, X_\zeta)$. Thus $|Z \cap D_x| < \kappa$ and $|Z \cap D| < \kappa$, hence there is $v \in D \setminus Z$. Then

$$\frac{1}{2} = d(y,v) = d(y,Z,v) = \frac{1}{2} + \inf\{d(z,v) : z \in Z\},$$

hence $\inf\{d(z,v) : z \in Z\} = 0$. There exists $z_0 \in Z$ such that $d(v,z_0) < \frac{1}{2}$. Since $v \notin Z$ and $z_0 \in Z$, we have $v \neq z_0$, $d(v,z_0) > 0$. Using the formula $\inf\{d(z,v) : z \in Z\} = 0$ again we obtain $z_1 \in Z$ such that $d(z_1,v) < d(z_0,v)$. Thus z_0 and z_1 are distinct elements of Z. Then $1 = d(z,z') \leqslant d(z,v) + d(z',v) < 1$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 6.4. *Assume that $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ and y is a weak middle point of some $D \in [D_x]^\kappa$, and y is added by F. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $D' \in [D]^\kappa$ and a weak middle point y' of D' such that*

$$d(y,y') + d(y',D') < d(y,D) + \varepsilon$$

and

(i) *$r(y') \leqslant r(y)$ and y' is added by S, or*
(ii) *$r(y') < r(y)$ and y' is added by F.*

Proof. Since y is added by F, there exist $\beta < \kappa^+$ and $Z \in [T]^{<\kappa}$ such that

$$y \in X_{\beta+2} \setminus T,$$

where $T = S(A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta), \bigcup_{\delta \leqslant \beta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta))$ and $d(y,t) = d(y,Z,t)$ for all $t \in T$.

By Lemma 6.3 we have $r(x) < r(y)$, hence $D_x \subseteq T$. By Lemma 4.2 we obtain a weak middle point $y' \in T$ of some $D' \in [D]^\kappa$ such that $d(y,y') + d(y',D') < d(y,D) + \varepsilon$. Observe that $r(y') \leqslant r(y)$, hence if y' is added by S, then the proof is complete.

Assume that y' is not added by S. By Lemma 6.3 the point y' is added by F, hence it suffices to show that $r(y') < r(y)$. Each point of T is added by S, A or it belongs to $X_{\beta+1}$. Since $y' \in T$ and y' is added neither by S, nor by A, we have $y \in X_{\beta+1}$. Thus $r(y') \leqslant \beta + 1 < r(y)$. □

Lemma 6.5. *If $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ are distinct points added by S, then $d(x,y) \geqslant 1/2$.*

Proof. Assume that $x \in T_\alpha$ and $y \in T_\beta$, where $\alpha \leqslant \beta$ and

$$T_\xi = S(A(X_{\xi+1}, X_\xi), \bigcup_{\delta \leqslant \xi} \mathcal{A}(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta)) \setminus A(X_{\xi+1}, X_\xi)$$

for $\xi \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. The point y is added by S, hence by (S2) there exists $Z \in [A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta)]^\kappa$ such that

$$d(y,w) = \frac{1}{2} + \inf\{d(z,w) : z \in Z\}$$

for all $w \in T_\beta \setminus \{y\}$. Since $T_\alpha \subseteq T_\beta$, we have $d(x,y) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$. □

Lemma 6.6. *Assume that $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ and y is a weak middle point of $D \in [D_x]^\kappa$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $D' \in [D]^\kappa$ and its weak middle point y' added by S such that $d(y,y') + d(y', D') < d(y,D) + \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\alpha, \delta_0 < \kappa^+$ be such that $r(x) = \alpha+2$ and $r(y) = \delta_0+2$. From Lemma 6.3 it follows that $\alpha < \delta_0$. Define $z_0 = y$, $D_0 = D$, $r(y) = \delta_0+2$ and assume that there exist $z_0, \ldots, z_n$, $D_n \subseteq \ldots \subseteq D_0$, $\delta_0 > \ldots > \delta_n > \alpha$ such that for all $i \leqslant n$:

(i) z_i is a weak middle point of D_i,
(ii) $d(z_{i-1}, z_i) + d(z_i, D_i) < d(z_{i-1}, D_{i-1}) + \varepsilon/2^{(i+3)}$ for all $i > 0$,
(iii) $D_i \in [D_x]^\kappa$,
(iv) $z_i \in X_{\delta_i+2} \setminus A(X_{\delta_i+1}, X_{\delta_i})$.

If $z_n \in S(A(X_{\delta_n+1}, X_{\delta_n}), \bigcup_{\delta \leqslant \delta_n} \mathcal{A}(X_{\delta+1}, X_\delta))$, then we define $y' = z_n$ and $D' = D_n$. Otherwise, by Lemma 6.4 we obtain $\alpha < \delta_{n+1} < \delta_n$, $D_{n+1} \in [D_n]^\kappa$ and a weak middle point

$$z_{n+1} \in X_{\delta_{n+1}+2} \setminus A(X_{\delta_{n+1}+1}, X_{\delta_{n+1}})$$

of D_{n+1} such that

$$d(z_n, z_{n+1}) + d(z_{n+1}, D_{n+1}) < d(z_n, D_n) + \frac{1}{2^{n+4}}.$$

Observe that for some $n < \omega$ the point z_n is added by S, since otherwise we would obtain an infinite decreasing sequence of ordinal numbers. The following estimate completes the proof:

$$\begin{aligned} d(z_0, z_n) + d(z_n, D_n) &\leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(z_{i-1}, z_i) + d(z_n, D_n) \leqslant \\ &\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(z_{i-1}, z_i) + d(z_{n-1}, z_n) + d(z_n, D_n) < \\ &\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(z_{i-1}, z_i) + d(z_{n-1}, D_{n-1}) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n+3}} < \ldots \\ &\ldots < d(z_0, D_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i+3}} < d(z_0, D_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.7. *For every $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ subspace D_x is hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+}.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that D_x is not hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+}. Thus there exist $\alpha < \kappa^+$ and $D \in [D_x]^\kappa$ with a middle point $z \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $x \in X_{\alpha+2} \setminus X_{\alpha+1}$. It follows from Lemma 6.6 that there exists $D' \in [D]^\kappa$ and its weak middle point z' added by S such that

$$d(z, z') + d(z', D') < \frac{3}{4}. \tag{2}$$

By Lemma 6.3, z' is not a middle point of D', hence $d(z', D') > 1/2$. Define $\varepsilon = d(z', D') - \frac{1}{2}$. Since z is a middle point of D, it is also a middle point of $D' \subseteq D$. By Lemma 6.6 for D' and its middle point z, we obtain a weak middle point z'' of some $D'' \in [D']^\kappa$ such that z'' is added by S and

$$d(z, z'') + d(z'', D'') < \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

Thus

$$d(z, z'') < \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon - d(z'', D'') = d(z', D') - d(z'', D'') < \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

By (2),

$$d(z, z') < \frac{3}{4} - d(z', D') < \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Thus $d(z', z'') \leqslant d(z', z) + d(z, z'') < \frac{1}{2}$. By (3), we have

$$d(z'', D'') < d(z', D') = d(z', D''),$$

hence $z' \neq z''$. Points z' and z'' are added by S, hence it follows from Lemma 6.5 that $d(z', z'') \geqslant 1/2$, contrary to $d(z', z'') < 1/2$. □

Lemma 6.8. *For every $x, t \in X_{\kappa^+}$, there is $Z \in [D_x]^{\leqslant\kappa}$ such that $d(t, y) = d(t, Z, y)$ for all $y \in D_x$.*

Proof. Fix $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ and let $\alpha < \kappa^+$ be such that $x \in X_{\alpha+2} \setminus X_{\alpha+1}$. Then $d(t, y) = d(t, x) + d(x, y) = d(t, \{x\}, y)$ for all $y \in D_x$ and $t \in A(X_{\alpha+2}, X_{\alpha+1}) \setminus D_x$. If $t \in D_x$, then $d(t, y) = d(t, \{t\}, y)$ for all $y \in D_x$.

Fix $\beta \geqslant \alpha$ and assume that for all $t \in A(X_{\beta+2}, X_{\beta+1})$ there exists $Z_t \in [D_x]^{\leqslant\kappa}$ such that $d(t, y) = d(t, Z_t, y)$ for all $y \in D_x$. Fix $t \in X_{\beta+3} \setminus X_{\beta+2}$ added by S. There exists a discrete subspace $Z \in [A(X_{\beta+2}, X_{\beta+1})]^\kappa$ such that $d(t, y) = d(t, Z, y)$ for all $y \in A(X_{\beta+2}, X_{\beta+1})$. From induction hypothesis, for all $z \in Z$ there exists $T_z \in [D_x]^{\leqslant\kappa}$ such that $d(z, y) = d(z, T_z, y)$ for all $y \in D_x$. Then $\bigcup_{z\in Z} T_z \in [D_x]^{\leqslant\kappa}$. Suppose that there exists $y \in D_x$ such that

$$\varepsilon = d(t, \textstyle\bigcup_{z\in Z} T_z, y) - d(t, y) > 0.$$

There exists $z \in Z$ such that $d(t,z)+d(z,y) < d(t,y)+\varepsilon/2$ and there exists $w \in T_z$ such that $d(z,w)+d(w,y) < d(z,y)+\varepsilon/2$. Then

$$d(t,w)+d(w,y) \leqslant d(t,z)+d(z,w)+d(w,y) < d(x,z)+d(z,y)+\varepsilon/2 < d(t,y)+\varepsilon = d(t,\textstyle\bigcup_{z\in Z} T_z, y) \leqslant d(t,w)+d(w,y),$$

a contradiction. The case of t being added by F or A is analogous. □

Lemma 6.9. *If $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ are distinct, then $|D_x \cap D_y| \leqslant 1$.*

Proof. Fix $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $x \neq y$. By (P5), there exist $\alpha, \beta < \kappa^+$ such that $x \in X_{\alpha+1} \setminus X_\alpha$, $y \in X_{\beta+1} \setminus X_\beta$, $D_x \in \mathcal{A}(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha)$ and $D_y \in \mathcal{A}(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta)$.

Consider the case $r(x) = r(y)$. By (A2), we have $D_x \cap D_y = \emptyset$.

Consider the case $r(x) < r(y)$. Then $\alpha + 2 = r(x) + 1 \leqslant r(y) = \beta + 1$, hence $X_{\alpha+1} \subseteq A(X_{\alpha+1}, X_\alpha) \subseteq X_{\beta+1}$. Therefore $D_x \cap D_y \subseteq X_{\beta+1} \cap D_y$. By (A1), we have $D_y \cap X_{\beta+1} = \{y\}$. □

Lemma 6.10. *Assume that $Y \subseteq X_{\kappa^+}$ is hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+} and $|Y| > \kappa^+$. Then there exists $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $Y \subseteq D_x$.*

Proof. Consider the case that there exists $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $|D_x \cap Y| > \kappa$. Suppose that there exists $y \in Y \setminus D_x$. By Lemma 6.8 there exists $Z \in [D_x]^{\leqslant\kappa}$ such that $d(y,t) = d(y,Z,t)$ for all $t \in D_x$. Since $|Z| < |D_x \cap Y|$, there exists $t \in D_x \cap Y \setminus Z$. Then $y \neq t$, hence

$$1 = d(y,t) = d(y,Z,t) = \inf\{d(y,z)+1 : z \in Z\}.$$

Since $y \notin Z$, there exist $z, z' \in Z$ such that $z \neq z'$ and $d(x,z), d(x,z') < 1/2$. Then $1 = d(z,z') \leqslant d(z,x)+d(x,z') < 1$, a contradiction.

Consider the case $|D_x \cap Y| \leqslant \kappa$ for all $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$. Define

$$\mathcal{K} = \{D_x : |D_x \cap Y| = \kappa\}.$$

Suppose that $|Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}| \geqslant \kappa$. There exists $T \in [Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}]^\kappa$. Thus $|D_x \cap T| < \kappa$ for all $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$. Since $|T| = \kappa$, there exists $\beta < \kappa^+$ such that $T \subseteq X_\beta$. From (S1) it follows that there exists a middle point $t \in X_{\beta+2}$ of T, contrary to the fact that $T \in [Y]^\kappa$ and Y is hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+}. Thus $|Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}| < \kappa$. Then $|Y \cap \bigcup \mathcal{K}| = |Y|$. If $|\mathcal{K}| \leqslant \kappa^+$, then

$$\kappa^+ < |Y \cap \textstyle\bigcup \mathcal{K}| = |\bigcup_{D_x \in \mathcal{K}} Y \cap D_x| \leqslant |\mathcal{K}| \cdot \sup\{|Y \cap D_x| : D_x \in \mathcal{K}\} \leqslant \kappa^+,$$

a contradiction. Thus $|\mathcal{K}| > \kappa^+$.

Suppose that there exist $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $r(x) = r(y)$ and $D_x, D_y \in \mathcal{K}$. Since $|D_x \cap Y| = |D_y \cap Y| = \kappa$, there exist $x' \in D_x \cap Y \setminus \{x\}$ and $y' \in D_y \cap Y \setminus \{y\}$. It follows from (A3) that

$$d(x',y') = d(x',x)+d(x,y') = 1 + d(x,y) + d(y,y') = 2 + d(x,y),$$

contrary to $d(x',y') = 1$.

Thus $|\mathcal{K} \cap \{D_x : r(x) = \alpha\}| \leqslant 1$ for all $\alpha < \kappa^+$. Then

$$|\mathcal{K}| = |\textstyle\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa^+}\{D_x \in \mathcal{K} : r(x) = \alpha\}| \leqslant \kappa^+,$$

contrary to $|\mathcal{K}| > \kappa^+$. □

Lemma 6.11. *For all $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$, if D is hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+} and $x \in D$, then $|D| \leqslant |D_x|$.*

Proof. Fix $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$. There exists $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that $x \in X_{\alpha+2} \setminus X_{\alpha+1}$. Fix D hereditarily without middle points in X_{κ^+} such that $x \in D$. If $|D| \leqslant \kappa^+$, then $|D| \leqslant |D_x|$, since, by (A1), $|D_x| > \kappa^+$. Assume that $|D_x| > \kappa^+$. It follows from Lemma 6.10 that there exists $y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $D \subseteq D_y$. There exists $\beta < \kappa^+$ such that $y \in X_{\beta+2} \setminus X_{\beta+1}$. If $\beta < \alpha$, then $\beta+3 \leqslant \alpha+2$ and $D_y \subseteq X_{\beta+3} \subseteq X_{\alpha+2}$, hence $|D_y| \leqslant |X_{\beta+3}| \leqslant |X_{\alpha+2}| < |D_x|$.

If $\beta = \alpha$, then $x, y \in D_y \cap X_{\beta+2}$ and, by (A1), $D_y \cap X_{\beta+2} = \{y\}$, hence $x = y$.

If $\beta > \alpha$, then $X_{\alpha+2} \subseteq X_{\beta+1}$. Thus $x \in D_y \cap X_{\beta+1} = \emptyset$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 6.12. *If x and y are distinct points of X_{κ^+}, then $\tau_\kappa(x, X_{\kappa^+}) \neq \tau_\kappa(y, X_{\kappa^+})$.*

Proof. Fix $x, y \in X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $x \neq y$. It follows from Lemma 6.7 and Lemma 6.11 that $\tau_\kappa(x, X_{\kappa^+}) = |D_x|$ and $\tau_\kappa(y, X_{\kappa^+}) = |D_y|$. If $r(x) = r(y)$, then, by (A2), we have $|D_x| \neq |D_y|$. If $r(x) < r(y)$, then, by (A1), we have $|D_x| < |D_y|$. □

Finally, we obtain the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 6.13. *X_{κ^+} is a rigid κ-superuniversal metric space.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists an isometry $f : X_{\kappa^+} \to X_{\kappa^+}$ such that $f(x) \neq x$ for some $x \in X_{\kappa^+}$. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that $\tau_\kappa(x, X_{\kappa^+}) = \tau_\kappa(f(x), X_{\kappa^+})$. Lemma 6.12 gives $\tau_\kappa(x, X_{\kappa^+}) \neq \tau_\kappa(f(x), X_{\kappa^+})$, a contradiction. Thus X_{κ^+} is rigid.

Theorem 6.2 says that X_{κ^+} is κ-superuniversal. □

Corollary 6.14. *If $\lambda > \kappa$ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal, then there exists a κ-superuniversal rigid metric space of cardinality λ.*

Proof. Observe that for a metric space X, a family $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(X)$ and a subset $Y \subseteq X$ we have

$$|F(X)| \leqslant \sum_{\mu<\kappa} (\mathfrak{c} \cdot |X|)^\mu \leqslant 2^\kappa \sum_{\mu<\kappa} |X|^\mu \leqslant 2^{\kappa \cdot |X|},$$

$$|S(X, \mathcal{G})| \leqslant |X| + |[X]^\kappa| \leqslant 2^{\kappa \cdot |X|},$$

$$|A(X, Y)| \leqslant \aleph_{\kappa + |X| \cdot 3}.$$

Fix $\alpha < \lambda$ and assume that $|X_\beta| < \lambda$ for every $\beta < \alpha$. If α is limit, then $|\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} X_\beta| < \lambda$, since λ is regular. If $\alpha = \beta + 2$, then

$$|A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta)| \leqslant \aleph_{\kappa + |X_{\beta+1}| \cdot 3} < \lambda$$

$$|S(A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta), \bigcup_{\gamma \leqslant \beta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\gamma+1}, X_\gamma))| \leqslant 2^{\kappa \cdot |A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta)|} < \lambda.$$

Analogously $|F(S(A(X_{\beta+1}, X_\beta), \bigcup_{\gamma\leqslant\beta} \mathcal{A}(X_{\gamma+1}, X_\gamma)))| < \lambda$. Thus $|X_\lambda| = \lambda$. □

References

[1] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, PWN, Warsaw 1977.

[2] S. H. Hechler, *Large superuniversal metric spaces*, Israel J. Math., 14 (1973), 115–148.

[3] H. H. Hung, *The amalgamation property for G-metric spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 37 (1972), 53–58.

[4] L. Janos, *A metric characterization of zero-dimensional spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 31 (1972), 268–270.

[5] B. Jónsson, *Homogeneous universal relational systems*, Math. Scand. 8 (1960), 137–142.

[6] M. Katětov, *On universal metric spaces*, in: General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra VI, Proc. Sixth Prague Topological Symposium 1986, Z. Frolík (ed.), Berlin 1988.

[7] J. Melleray, *On the geometry of Urysohn's universal metric space*, Topology Appl., 154 (2) (2007), 384–403.

[8] P. Urysohn, *Sur un espace métrique universel*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 180 (1925), 803–806.

University of Silesia, Institute of Mathematics, Bankowa 14, 40-007 Katowice, POLAND

E-mail address: wbielas@us.edu.pl